under that crop would have been used for any other purpose, that rental value is also taken into account. All these minor factors are also taken into account, including transport which the honourable Member has mentioned. They then come to a conclusion and that conclusion is reflected in their report. The Government usually referred these to the various States and the States' responses are also invited; it is not that the States are not consulted. After having done that exercise, the overall picture of the country's economy is taken into account, and based on the recommendations of this Commission it is done. I should say that only in one or two cases may be the recommendations of the Commission have not been at par but it has rarely been decreased, to my knowledge at least. Usually it has been on the high side. The Government has always favoured the farmers. Even in spite of the fact that the Commission had recommended a certain price, the Government sometimes felt that in the overall interests of the grower the price needs to be increased slightly. In this case also the same is the case. The recommendation of the CACP was different whereas the Government thought that the price needs to be a little higher so that the growers can have some kind of incentive, a little bit of remuneration. These are the factors which go into the fixing of the prices of the various crops which are covered under the procurement policy or support policy or statutory price support policy. I am sure the honourable Members will agree with me that much more could not have been done and we are following zealously the protection of the interests of the grower. Here in the case of jute the problem is that a grower often gets neglcted, firstly because the loan which he requires is advanced by some unscrupulous elements in West Bengal or Assam or Bihar. I would request the hon. Members to utilise their good influence with the State Government and request the State Government I have myself requested to organise a very good co-operative system through which the growers could be given better loaus on concessional terms. We are prepared to help the State Governments in organising such a co-operative movement which will help the growers of jute at the primary level. On concessional interest rates they should be given loans so that they are not fleeced by the middlemen. And, Sir, they could be organised also to put up a plant in the co-operative sector so that the jute growers can bring and process their own goods. We would prefer this. I would request the hon. Members to use their good influence with the local governments and see that the growers are helped by organising a co-operative movement for the jute growers.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Your estimate has reduced it to Rs. 225. How come this ? This, we wanted to know. Mr. Jyoti Basu had made an estimate which was higher in that year, and this has come down. I am at a loss to understand this.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Last year the price was Rs. 215. We have increased it by Rs. 10|- I do not know how we have reduced it.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING THE 24TH FEBRUARY, 1986.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITARAM KESRI) : With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government business in this House during the week commencing 24th February, 1986, will consist of:—

1. Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Ordinance, 1986 and consideration and passing of the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 1986.

2. Consideration and passing of the following Bills, as passed by the Lok Sabha.

(i) The Dock Worker (Safety, Health and Welfare) Bill, 1985.

(ii) The Sales Promotion Employee (Condition of Service) Amendment Bill, 1985.

3. Discussion on the Motion of Thank on the President's Address from Wednesday, the 26th February, 1986.

As Members are already aware, the Railway Budget for 1986-87 would be laid at 2-30 P. M. on Wednesday, the 26th Feburary, and the General Budget for 1986-87 at 6-30 P.M. on Friday, the 28th February, 1986.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE Continued Strike by Teachers of Delhi Univesity— *Contd.*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have carefully gone through the statement made by the Minister of State for Education and I must say that I am disappointed because I was expecting that the crucial point about whether the agreement arrived at in 1983 has been adhered to or not would be explained to me because that is the bone of contention, whether the agreement arrived at in 1983 has been violated, has been breached or the teachers are in the wrong.

Frankly, I believe that while in the rest of the country strikes take place generally on the issues of pay scales and grades and all that, this strike, this particular strike is slightly of a different nature. It is a strike with a difference, in which the principal issue is violation of an agreement, and it is only incidental that the issues pertain to grades and selection and promotion and stagnation and housing and all that.

Sir, the four demands for which the teachers have gone on strike this time have been indicated.

Number one, withdrawal of the UGC's instructions regarding the termination of the merit promotion scheme. That is number one. Is it not true that this merit promotion scheme had been agreed upon in 1983? It had been agreed upon in 1983. That too after a strike. At that time the strike was focussed on these issues. If I were personally to recall the background of the strike in 1982, the teachers of the Delhi University and the affiliated colleges were feeling greatly agitated over the problems of stagnation, promotions and housing. The UGC's response used to be cold. The UGC's response generally used to be negative on the plea that we have to consider the national perspective and we cannot agree to the demands made by you. After approaching the authorities and failing to receive any response they went on strike in October, 1982. While they were on strike a public litigation case came up in the Delhi High Court. In that public litigation case the Court took into account the damage being done to the students and the cause of education in Delhi. So, they called the counsels of the UGC, of the Government and the DUTA and discussed with them whether an agreement could be arrived at. A formula was proposed by the Delhi High Court which is something extraordinary. On the basis of that formula an agreement was ultimately arrived at between the Vice-Chancellor and the DUTA. That agreement, is part of the letter written to the DUTA. A quotation where of has been given in the Statement also. There too I notice that the Vice-Chancellor would